

The production manager has priced out the deionized water system at just under \$10,000 with utility costs averaging about \$1,900 per year. Vendor information indicates that filters must be changed at least once every three months for a total of \$1,100 annually. Maintenance can be purchased under contract for an additional \$400 per year for a total cost of \$13,400. From the analysis of waste streams conducted in step #1, the team estimates that use of the organic solvent costs the company in excess of \$9,000 annually. In its analysis, the team included the annual cost attributes listed below:

Raw materials cost	\$5,200
Treatment and disposal costs	\$1,200
- transportation	
- tipping fees	
Labor costs	\$500
- handling raw material	
- handling waste	
- cleanup of spills	
Reporting requirements	\$400
- permitting requirements	
- RCRA manifesting	
- SARA reporting	
Operating costs for pretreatment	\$700
- utilities; maintenance	
Toxicity monitoring	\$1,400
<hr/> TOTAL	<hr/> \$9,400

Since the payback period would be within 2 years, the production manager gave the cost criterion a score of 6, multiplied by the weight of 9, for a total score of 54. Although the actual numbers are fictitious, they illustrate the importance of including **all** costs associated with waste generation. Hopefully the methodological framework presented in the first two examples will provide the reader with a basis for developing a ranking system tailored to the individual needs of the company. Remember, the ranking system is useful only if it reflects the priorities established by corporate policy and simplifies the complex matrix of tradeoffs. Deciding which waste reduction alternative(s) is appropriate at any given time is not a trivial matter; it requires an explicit ranking system in order to set up the common ground for discussion.